

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2745 of 2013

Navin Kumar Verma S/O Late Braj Nandan Prasad R/O Mohalla- Madhubani,
Amla Tola, Manjhli Chawk, P.O.- Khajanchi Hat, P.S.- Khajanchi Hat,
District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food And Consumer Protection Department, Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Patna, Sone Bhawan, Veer Chand Patel Path, Patna
3. Chief Administrator Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bahwan, Veer Chand Patel Path, Patna
4. District Manager, Bihar State Food And Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., Purnea, District- Purnea
5. Chief cum Conducting Officer, Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bhawan, Veer Chand Patel Path, Patna
6. Deputy Chief Auditor, Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bhawan, Veer Chand Patel Path, Patna

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Brij Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Prashant Pratap, GP-2
For the BSFC	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

16 16-07-2024 Heard Mr. Brij Nandan Prasad, learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Prashant Pratap,
learned GP-2 appearing on behalf of the State and Mr.
Shailendra Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation.

2. Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation informs that the present writ petition is not

maintainable, in view of the fact that petitioner has already filed review before the appropriate authority, as per the provision of Rule 28 of the Bihar State Food And Civil Supplies Corporation Service Conduct and Disciplinary Rules, 2001.

3. Considering the aforesaid submission made on behalf of the respondent, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to avail the remedy of review, however, he submits that the time taken in the present writ petition may be condoned.

4. Considering the aforesaid submission and willingness of the petitioner to prefer review before the appropriate authority, the Revisional Authority must consider to condone the time taken in the present writ petition, which was filed in the year 2013 and has been kept pending till date. The petitioner in this regard may file limitation petition for condonation of delay, before the Revisional Authority.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J.)

Ashishsingh/-

U			
---	--	--	--